

REMARKS

Claims 1, 3-10, and 12 are now pending in this application for which applicants seek reconsideration.

Amendment

Claims 2-8 have been amended in order to overcome the objection brought forth by the examiner.

Claim 12 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter. Claim 12 has been amended in order to direct in toward “a computer-readable medium storing a computer program,” which is statutory subject matter. Therefore, applicants respectfully request that the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §101 be withdrawn.

Claims 2 and 11 have been cancelled. Additionally, the remaining claims have been amended in order to distinguish over the prior art of record.

Art Rejection

Claims 1 and 3-12 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Rajan et al. (U.S.P. 6,633,910.) Regarding independent claims 1, 9-10, and 12, Rajan et al. fails to disclose that in the “notification content storing step, the update contents extracted between the immediately preceding output timing and the present output timing are sequentially added to the notification content,” as claimed. In the present invention, an update to data, or more specifically, a web page, is tracked, and each update to this data is added to a notification content, which in turn is output at regular time intervals. This methodology is covered by the claim language of the present application. In contrast, Rajan et al. discloses tracking changes to specific data across multiple web pages, and when a certain notification condition occurs, alerting a user to a change per se. While it is true that Rajan et al. discloses checking for changes to data at a predetermined timing, it does not disclose outputting the notification content at a predetermined timing, as presently claimed. While Rajan et al. does disclose outputting summary data describing the nature of the changes (col. 16, line 56 – col. 17, line 5), it does not specifically disclose that this summary data includes the update contents extracted between a preceding output timing and a present output timing listed in a sequential order. Hence, Rajan et al. does not and can not anticipate the independent claims, and therefore applicants respectfully request that the rejection be withdrawn.

Claim 2 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Rajan et al. in view of Iwayama et al. (U.S.P. 6,735,615.) Iwayama et al. cannot overcome the deficiencies of Rajan et al. as set forth above. Therefore, applicants respectfully request that the rejection be withdrawn.

Conclusion

Applicants submit that claims 1, 3-10, and 12 patentably distinguish over the applied references and are in condition for allowance. Should the examiner have any issues concerning this reply or any other outstanding issues remaining in this application, applicants urge the examiner to contact the undersigned to expedite prosecution.

Respectfully submitted,

ROSSI, KIMMS & McDOWELL LLP

31 JANUARY 2007
DATE

/Marc A. Rossi/
MARC A. ROSSI
REG. NO. 31,923

P.O. Box 826
ASHBURN, VA 20146-0826
703-726-6020 (PHONE)
703-726-6024 (FAX)